

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and new claim 32 has been added. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 28-32 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 11 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0060] on page 16 to paragraph [0066] on page 18. Support for new claim 32 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0040] on page 10.

### Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Schauser (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,855 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is patentable because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests "enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference" (emphasis added). While Slaughter discloses accessing a computer network via a remote access server, Slaughter does not teach or suggest accessing an application on a target computer while participating in a data conference and sharing the application on the target computer with others participating in the data conference, as required by claim 1. Schauser, which does not disclose data conferencing, fails to teach or suggest these deficiencies in Slaughter. Further, Loveland (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,413) cited in the Office Action of June 6, 2006 also fails to teach or suggest these deficiencies in Slaughter. Loveland discloses providing users with multiple modes of access to applications (e.g., IMR application 202) through a communications server including a PSTN telephone 304, an IP telephone 302, a videoconference phone 306, and an instant message 310 (see column 16, lines 16-36 and Figure 5). However, nowhere does Loveland disclose accessing an application on a target computer while participating in a data conference and sharing the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference. Simply disclosing multiple modes of

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

accessing applications through a communications server, including a videoconference phone, does not teach or suggest this claim limitation.

For the reasons given above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Independent claim 11 has limitations similar to those of claim 1, and is patentable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 12, and 28-30 depend from claim 11, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 11.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Schauser (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,855 B1), and further in view of Easley et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0142842 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 31 depends from claim 11, and is patentable for at least the reasons given above for claim 11.

### New Claim

New claim 32 depends on claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. New claim 32 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references disclose a phone authentication procedure for remotely accessing a target computer comprising "accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer" and "dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer" (emphasis added). While Loveland discloses user authentication over a phone, Loveland does not teach or suggest accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer and dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer to perform the authentication. Rather, the system of Loveland receives a call from the user requesting authentication over the phone (see column 20, lines 1-5 and step 600 "Receive Call From User" in Figure 8). The system of Loveland does not call the user, much less call the user using a telephone number received from a target computer that the user is attempting to access remotely.

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Counsel's Deposit Account No. 150665 for any necessary fees, and is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required and to credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account 150665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: September 1, 2006

By: Eugene Worley  
Eugene Worley  
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600  
Irvine, CA 92614-2558  
Tel. 949-567-6700  
Fax: 949-567-6710  
Customer Number: 34313